

As a teacher, I find it hard to explain to children how we are electing a president fairly in this country, when companies, such as Sinclair Broadcasting, have the power to control what we see and hear. We are supposed to be a country in which major companies do not control the government, but this is apparently not the case in this instance. My question would be, what will they be getting in return for this Bush push?? Certainly, this is not done without the consideration of payback. I hope that you will step in and curtail this action before it begins, as I believe it will be a black mark on this election.

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. Instead of something produced at "News Central" far away, it's more important that we see real people from our own communities and more substantive news about issues that matter.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.

Thank you.
Susan Zimmerman